DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 929 SP 026 035

AUTHOR Kozma, Ernest J.; Walker, John H.
TITLE Using a Policy Classification Model to Analyze Major Changes Regarding Control and Administration of Policies Relative to Professional Staff.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 18p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Educational Change; *Educational Legislation; *Educational Policy; Higher Education; *Policy Formation; Staff Development; *State Standards; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *South Carolina

ABSTRACT

There has been a diversity of activity to change policies relating to the recruitment, admission, and preparation of new educational professionals in college and university settings. These policies, coupled with state mandated polices to upgrade the competence of current teachers and administrators, has resulted in a great amount of policy to analyze. Policy models can be helpful in analyzing the recent legislative mandates regarding training and staff development of education professionals. This paper is organized around the following topics: (1) A brief description is given of a policy model that brings together some policy systems theory, some policy process theory, and some policy product theory; (2) Major components of the South Carolina Educator Improvement act of 1979 and the Education Improvement Act of 1984 that are related to the training and development of professional staff are briefly reviewed; (3) The policy classification scheme presented in the policy model is used to analyze the structural, regulative, allocative, and redistributive effects of some of the major components of the Education Improvement Act of 1979 and the Education Improvement Act of 1984; and (4) Some major observations and conclusions are drawn about what these policy effects may really mean to those interested in the education of educators in South Carolina. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED258929

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

USING A POLICY CLASSIFICATION MODEL TO ANALYZE MAJOR CHANGES REGARDING CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION OF POLICIES RELATIVE TO PROFESSIONAL STAFF

DR. ERNEST J. KOZMA
DR. JOHN H. WALKER

Introduction 1

Description of Policy Process Model 2

Legislation 4

Selected Topics for Policy Analysis 8

Major Conclusions and Observations 13

Bibliography 16

SP026035

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. J. Kozma

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Introduction

The educational reform movement of the last two years has produced a barrage of initiatives to improve public schooling in the United States. The number of reform oriented reports and level of policy making activity among the states appears to be at an unprecedented level.

Interestingly enough, one of the main targets addressed in the reports, as well as in legislative activity, is the improvement of teachers and school administrators. This fact seems to make a profound statement to those institutions currently involved in the education of teachers and school administrators. There is a high level of dissatisfaction with the products of the approaches traditionally used to educate teachers and school administrators.

The diversity of activity that has occurred to change policies relating to the recruitment, admission, and preparation of new educational professionals in college or university settings reflects this dissatisfaction. These policies, coupled with recently mandated policies to upgrade the competence of current teachers and administrators, gives educators of school personnel a mindboggling amount of policy to analyze.

Sorting out the people and institutions that will be affected by all of this activity to upgrade school personnel is a very complex procedure in any typical state. Determining policy effects is particularly difficult in a state like South Carolina where, for the last five years, the legislature has been very actively writing new mandates regarding school personnel.

It is the thesis of the authors that policy models can be very helpful in analyzing the recent legislative mandates regarding training and staff development of educational professionals. Policy models can help identify categories and matrices that force one to ask probing questions concerning the intended as well as actual effects of the new policy mandates.

This presentation will be organized around the following topics:

1. A brief description will be given of a policy model that brings together some policy systems theory, some policy process theory, and some policy product theory;
2. Major components of the S.C. Educator Improvement Act of 1979 and the Education Improvement Act of 1984 that are related to the training and development of professional staff will be briefly reviewed.
3. The primary interest of this presentation will be to utilize the policy classification scheme presented in the policy model to analyze the structural, regulative, allocative, and redistributive effects of some of the major components of the Education Improvement Act of 1979 and the

Education Improvement Act of 1984.

4. Some major observations and conclusions will be drawn about what these policy effects may really mean to those interested in the education of educators in South Carolina.

Description of Policy Process Model

Accounting for the activities and people that have some influence over public policy development in an open democracy is a very complex task. The complexities of educational policy development are even greater due to the number of people in the population that have a direct interest in education, the perceived value of education in our society, the different levels and branches of government that are involved in educational policy development and the recent thrust to solve all perceived educational problems posthaste. Sorting out the people and activities that determine who gets what, when, where, and how and determining who can do what, when, where, and how is indeed a burdensome task.

A review of literature that has evolved in the area of policy studies over the last two decades reveals considerable interest in the use of policy models as helpful tools to explain policy development. It appears possible to classify these models into general categories. There are models that emphasize the interaction of formal/informal institutional systems within given political environments.

Other models are based on the hypothesis that policy development is processual in nature. These models assume that there are patterns and recurring sequences which can be used to analyze the processes typically involved in policy development. These steps and stages of policy development can be identified and delimited even though in reality the categories may overlap or be articulated differently in different political environments.

Additional models have been developed to analyze the products or outcomes of policy processes. Typical categories of these policy outcomes are: (1) structural outcomes that create guidelines and hierarchies; (2) regulative outcomes that regulate activities and behaviors; (3) allocative outcomes that regulate resources or benefits; and (4) redistributive outcomes that redistribute either power or resources.

Having reviewed these different types of policy models, we have concluded that it might be possible to assemble a model that utilizes some of the best ideas of these different approaches to explain policy development. This model is outlined on the following page.

This model contains a broad range of categories and matrices that can be used to generate questions that must be raised in the analysis of any type

POLICY MODEL

SYSTEM(S)	PROCESS	PROCESS OUTPUT	POLICY EFFECT
FORMAL Administrative Executive Judicial Legislative	Problem Identification	Defining problem for policy action	
	Problem Formulation	Shaping course of policy action	Allocative Who gets what? when? where? how?
	Legitimization	Adopting policy in form that complies with legal standards	Regulative Who can do what? when? where? how?
INFORMAL Professional Groups Civil Rights Groups Taxpayer Groups Other Interest Groups Ad Hoc Groups	Application	Implementation of policy according to legal standards	Structural Additions,deletions to structure involved in policy implementation
	Evaluation	Judging effects of application of policy	
	Augmentation	Reshaping or extending policy to fit new circumstances or demands	Redistributive Additions,deletions, changes in resource allocation and authority allocation

of public policy. The model recognizes that both formal and informal systems interact in given political environments to produce public policy.

The model also assumes that there are identifiable steps or processes that typically take place in the development of almost any type of public policy. There may be unique activities by either formal or informal political systems in each of the stages of policy development. For example, only formal political systems have the authority to legitimize a policy solution. On the other hand any type of formal or informal political system may be involved in the pre-legitimization stages of policy development. Professional groups can frequently exert their greatest clout in the application of policy and in the identification of problems that need to be addressed as a result of applying the policy.

The authors theorize that such a comprehensive model could be especially helpful in analyzing the effects of recent legislative mandates regarding the control of training and development of professional staff in South Carolina. Before proceeding to this analysis a brief overview of the 1979 South Carolina Educator Act and the 1984 Education Improvement Act will be presented.

Legislation

Two major pieces of legislation have been passed in the last five years that affect the control and administration of policies relative to professional staff in South Carolina. In 1979 the state legislature passed a package of legislation entitled The Training, Certification and Evaluation of Public Educators. The legislative purpose of this act was to:

1. Upgrade the standards for educators
2. Assure that prospective teachers have basic reading, mathematics and writing skills.
3. Improve the educator training programs and the evaluation procedures for those programs.
4. Assure that prospective teachers know and understand their teaching areas
5. Enable the use of evaluation standards that will aid in determining whether beginning teachers can apply fundamental teaching skills in the classroom.

The intent of the act was to be carried out giving specific responsibilities to various segments of the political structure. The State Board of Education and the Commission on Higher Education were required to:

1. Develop and implement a plan for continuous evaluation and upgrading of standards for training programs of colleges and universities.
2. Adopt policies that insure balanced and trained visiting teams.
3. Require the students complete a basic skills test mandated by the Act.
4. Require students to complete a full semester of student teaching.
5. Adopt an evaluation standard that includes that use of an instrument mandated by the Act and at least three evaluations made by trained evaluators.

The Act provided for a special project to develop teacher examinations and evaluation instruments. The project was mandated to have a basic skills examination, a teacher evaluation instrument and the teaching area examinations in place by July 1, 1982. In addition, procedures were to be established to evaluate all certified personnel whose duties include classroom teaching. Staff development programs were then to be established based on the deficiencies discovered in the evaluations and the recertification requirements of all public school teachers were to be in courses and work relevant to the area of recertification.

An entirely revised contract system was put in place providing for a provisional period, and a sequence of annual contracts culminating in a continuing contract. Movement from one contract status to another is dependent on successfully completing evaluation based on the state mandated evaluation instrument. Much of the development work mandated by the law was to be done through an Education Improvement Task Force that was created by the Act and was separate from the existing educational structure. The State Department was required by the law to co-operate with and in the final analysis implement the Task Force's findings.

South Carolina Education Improvement Act of 1984

The South Carolina Education Improvement Act of 1984 (EIA) is a comprehensive legislative act that attempts to do exactly as its title indicates. The legislation includes sections dealing with the following topics:

1. Raising student performance by increasing academic standards at all grade levels.
2. Strengthening the teaching and testing of basic skills utilizing an exit examination and a basic promotion policy.
3. Evaluating the teaching profession by strengthening teacher

training, evaluation and compensation.
4. Improving leadership, management and fiscal efficiency at all levels.
5. Guaranteeing results by implementing strict quality controls and rewarding productivity.
6. Creating more effective partnership between the schools, parents, the community and business.
7. Providing school buildings conducive to improve student learning.

Certain sections of the legislation, dealing with educational professionals, is of greater concern for our analysis in this study. These sections will be briefly reviewed. The legislative purpose of the first of the relevant sections is to elevate the teaching profession by strengthening teacher training, evaluation and compensation. These purposes will be carried out by the following activities:

1. State universities and secondary schools will promote teaching as a career.
2. An incentive loan program will be offered to attract students to areas of critical need. These loans will be forgiven at a rate of 20% each year if the recipient teaches in a critical need area.
3. The State may grant provisional certificates to those who have earned bachelor's degrees in an area of critical need but who have not met certification requirements.
4. The average teacher salary will be increased and maintained to equal the projected average for the southeast.
5. A teacher incentive program will be developed and a time table for implementation is included.
6. Standards for the approval of teacher education will be upgraded.
7. Selected colleges will develop centers of excellence that are designed to promote excellence in teaching.
8. Effective teaching information will be included in inservice training for all teachers.
9. Tuition reimbursement will be provided every two years for completion of a three credit hour course and working one year in the field of specialization.
10. The teacher work year will increase to 190 days and the State will develop a computer program system to reduce the burden of paper work on classroom teachers.
11. An objective evaluation system for teachers will be

developed and formal evaluations will take place at least every three years.

The EIA has as a major objective the improvement of leadership, management and fiscal efficiency at all levels. The following items are included to achieve this objective:

1. Prospective candidates for school principalships will be assessed by the State Department of Education for instructional leadership and management capabilities.
2. Admission requirements will be increased for graduate programs in school administration at all state supported colleges and universities.
3. Every two years school administrators will be required to take part in approved seminars.
4. School districts will evaluate school administrators annually.
5. An incentive program for school principals will be developed on a time schedule included in the legislation.

Another initiative of the EIA is to guarantee results by implementing strict quality controls and rewarding productivity. This will be accomplished by the following:

1. The State Board will establish an incentive grant fund to reward schools and school districts for exceptional performance.
2. Each school will have a school improvement council composed of parents, teachers and students. An annual school improvement report will be made.
3. The State Board and the State Superintendent of Education have power to intervene in school districts that have seriously impaired educational programs.

S. C. Act 187

PROBLEM ADDRESSED	LEGISLATIVE MANDATE	IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	POLICY EFFECTS
Assure that teacher education majors in college can demonstrate minimum competency in reading, writing and math	The State Board of Education through the State Department of Education shall administer basic skills exam for freshman/sophomore teacher education major two times per year	July 1, 1981	Allocative Who gets what? when? where? how?
Assure a more effective plan for the evaluation and upgrading of standards for program approval and graduate education training program	State Board will adopt policies and procedure which will result in trained visiting teams with a balanced composition of teachers, administrators and higher education faculties	August 1979	Regulative Who can do what? when? where? how?
Insufficient amount of field based training in teacher education training programs	All colleges and universities that offer undergraduate degrees in education shall require that students successfully complete one semester of student teaching	July 1, 1981	Structural Additions, deletions changes to structure involved in policy implementation
Haphazard method of evaluating student teacher during undergraduate college experience	Each student teacher shall be evaluated at least three times by a trained representative of the college or university in which the practice teacher is enrolled using a uniform State Department of Education evaluation instrument	July 1, 1981	Redistributive Additions, deletions, changes in resource allocation and authority allocation
Determining competence of teacher in subject area taught	Use established cutoff scores on the specific teaching area exams of the National Teachers Examination as the basis for awarding teaching certificate	August, 1979	

Develop a statewide system of teacher evaluation tied to differentiated system of teacher contracts	The State Board through the State Department of Education shall establish procedures whereby each school district shall evaluate in the classroom all certified personnel whose duties involve teaching in the classroom	August 1979 through August, 1984

SOUTH CAROLINA IMPROVEMENT ACT 1984

PROBLEM ADDRESSED	LEGISLATIVE MANDATE	IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	POLICY EFFECTS
Supply of Teachers	All schools must offer college preparatory programs		
	All schools provide programs for the gifted and talented including advanced placement	1987 programs in all elementary and secondary schools	Allocative Who gets what? when? where? how?
	Provide more relevant vocational training	1987-88 fifty % of graduates must be placed in field of study	
	One half-day programs for four year old children	July 1, 1985	Regulative Who can do what? when? where how?
	Provide remedial and compensatory programs		
	Increase math and science requirements 30/1 ratio in math and		Structural Additions, deletions, changes to structure involved in policy implementation
	language arts		
	Emphasize teaching as a career in schools and colleges		
	Develop forgivable loan program for prospective teachers	Jan. 1985 implemented	Redistributive Additions, deletions, changes in resource allocation and authority allocation
	Provide conditional teaching certificates in critical areas		

Develop statewide teacher incentive program	1986-87 1985-86 tuition reimbursement program	

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1984

PROBLEM ADDRESSED	LEGISLATIVE MANDATE	IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	POLICY EFFECTS
Improve leadership, management and fiscal efficiency of the schools	Education leadership academy developed by the State Dept.	1984-1985 use NASSP Springfield consortium material	
	Assessment of principals by State Department Assessment Center	1984-85 24 centers by 1985-86	Allocative Who gets what? when? where? how?
	Principal incentive program	Identify criteria 84-85 Develop 3 programs 85-86 Pilot Test 86-87 Statewide implementation 87-88	
	Evaluation of principals	84-85 Advisory committee formed, State Board adopts criteria 85-86 Minimum statewide performance standards approved, develop and test instrument 86-87 Field test 87-88 implementation	Regulative Who can do what? when? where? how? Structural Additions, deletions, changes to structure involved in policy implementation
	Inservice training	84-85 P.E.T. program selected 1200 educators trained 85-86 continue 86-87 all schools implement activities based on effective schools research	Redistributive Additions, deletions, changes in resource allocation and authority allocation
	Inservice for administrators each two year period operated by the State Department	84-85 Survey of needs Advisory board selected develop schedule implement first series through the Leadership Academy develop computer monitoring system for checking attendance	

Principal apprenticeships	84-85 Regulations for content and selection Review applications 32 awards made Design evaluation instrument	

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT - 1984

PROBLEM ADDRESSED	LEGISLATIVE MANDATE	IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	POLICY EFFECTS
Hiring guidelines used by local districts to employ professional staff	State Board of Education shall adopt regulations to ensure that school districts develop recruiting and employment plans that select personnel on the basis of qualifications and merit	August, 1985	Allocative Who gets what? when? where? how?
Support efforts to improve classroom teaching practice and procedures through incentive grants to teacher	The State Board through the State Department of Education shall establish and administer a competitive grant program whereby teachers will be awarded grants for the purpose of improving teaching practice and procedures	August, 1985	Regulative Who gets what? when? where? how?
Suggest school efforts to implement exemplary programs to improve instruction	The State Board through the State Department of Education shall establish and administer a competitive grant program whereby schools will be awarded grants to implement exemplary programs to improve instruction		Structural Additions, deletions, changes to structure involved in policy implementation
Establishment of a model inservice training program based on effective schools research	The State Board through the State Department of Education shall establish and administer inservice training based on effective schools research	1984-85 Identify programs 1986-87 Implementing a program in all districts	Redistributive Additions, deletions, changes in resource allocation and authority allocation

Establishment of teacher incentive pay system	The State Board of Education acting with the assistance of the select committee shall cause to be developed and implemented a teacher incentive program to reward teacher who demonstrates superior performance and productivity	1984-85 -- 1986-87

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1984

PROBLEM ADDRESSED	LEGISLATIVE MANDATE	IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	POLICY EFFECTS
Foster the development of "centers of excellence" in teacher training in public or private colleges	The Commission on Higher Education, in consultation with the State Board of Education may contract with selected public or private colleges and universities to provide centers of excellence in programs designed to train teachers	January, 1985	Allocative Who gets what? when? where? how?
Establish a tuition reimbursement program for teachers, instructional supervisors and principals	All principals, instructional supervisors, and classroom teachers are eligible for tuition reimbursement at a rate consistent with that charged at public colleges and universities for successful completion of a three hour course in their field of specialization so long as they work in that field in S. C. public schools for the succeeding year		Regulative Who can do what? when? where? how? Structural Additions, deletions, changes to structure involved in policy implementation
Improving training of current and prospective teachers	Additional and upgraded approval standards must be developed, in consultation with the Commission on Higher Education, and promulgated by the State Board of Education programs	Beginning 1984-85 academic year	Redistributive Additions, deletions, changes in resource allocation and authority allocation

BEST COPY

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT

PROBLEM ADDRESSED	LEGISLATIVE MANDATE	IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	POLICY EFFECTS
Monitoring Implementation of EIA	In order to assist in and supervise expenditure of funds for EIA a select committee shall be formed to make recommendations to the State Board on Implementing Provisions of the Act.		Allocative Who gets what? when? where?
	The Governor and State Superintendent shall be the Committee on Financing Excellence in Education and the Steering Committee of the Business Education partnership to review implementation of the Act.	1984	Regulative Who can do what? when? where? how?
	The State Board of Education and State Superintendent of Education shall establish a public accountability division in the State Department of Education		Structural Additions, deletions changes to structure involved in policy implementation Redistributive Additions, deletions changes in resource allocation and authority allocation

Major Conclusions and Observations

The current flurry of initiatives, purporting to improve public schools has generated an even greater number of assessments that attempt to evaluate and categorize these activities. Most of the evaluations attempt to make judgments by isolating various changes and determining the value of the activity as a separate item. This is certainly a worthwhile and needed type of analysis. The criticisms and changes in education are so many in number today that additional types of analyses are needed. Without some systematic consideration of the possible ramifications the many changes will have on the making of educational policy, any evaluation is less than complete. South Carolina has passed two major pieces of legislation in the

BEST COPY

last five years. The legislation has been described as the most comprehensive educational reform legislation in the nation. Understanding what this legislation has done and what this legislation will mean for education in South Carolina can be aided by the use of a policy process model for analysis.

Allocative Outcomes

South Carolina's recent education legislation provides numbers of examples of regulations that provide for the allocation of benefits or resources. Prospective teachers, for example, have the opportunity of obtaining forgivable loans. Those students or graduates in critical areas can obtain conditional teaching certificates without completing the education requirements. A number of benefits were included in the legislation for school administrators. An incentive pay program is to be developed for administrators. Some prospective principals will have an apprenticeship program open to them. A tuition reimbursement program for recertification is to be provided for administrators. Resources are provided by the legislation and specifically regulated to provide for the outcomes described. Study of the policy models included can show how these and many other items listed can effect the allocative scheme of who gets what? when? where? and how?

Structural Outcomes

A number of oversight committees have been mandated to monitor the EIA. The relationships of these committees with such entities as the Commission on Higher Education, the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education will impact on the policy structure. The development of the various statewide evaluation instruments, the State Department Assessment Center and the State Department Leadership Academy and the formation of a Public Accountability Division in the State Department will effect the policy structure.

The comprehensive legislation has added to deleted from and made changes to structures involved in policy implementation. For example, colleges and universities involved in teacher education and administrator training have to deal with new hierarchies regarding admission of students to program student evaluations at the beinning and end of programs and general accreditation and approval of their programs. The State Board of Eduation is increasingly involved in new liason with the Commission of Higher Education in decisions relating to teacher education in South Carolina. As these new entities of authority and accountability evolve, it appears that

problems will emerge regarding the identification of roles that different agencies should have in performing the tasks associated with the education and staff development of school personnel.

Regulative Outcomes

The regulative outcomes of the legislation derived from the many activities mandated have changed the answers to questions concerning who can do what? when? where? and how?. Teacher preparation programs have been regulated to offer a full semester of student teaching, to evaluate student teachers at least three times using a state mandated instrument. A student cannot be accepted into the College of Education until a State mandated basic skills test is successfully passed.

Local school districts will be provided recruiting and employment plans developed by the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education to insure the employees will be selected on qualifications and merit. School districts must receive an assessment profile provided by the State Department Assessment Center for each candidate for a principal's position. These are a few of the regulative outcomes that should be analyzed and studied as it is apparent that new regulative structures are developing.

Redistributive Outcomes

It is apparent that redistribution of authority and resources are occuring as a result of implementing these statutes. During the development of PL 187 the legislature indicated its dissatisfaction with the use of delegated authority given the State Board and State Department to develop and administer policies relative to the education of educational professionals by establishing an independent legislatively appointed entity to develop the guidelines and regulations for policies included in Act 187. With the extensive authority now delegated to the State Board and State Department of Education in the Education Improvement Act, it is very apparent that a new redistribution of resources and authority is occuring.

Conclusion

In an era when massive attempts are being made to redirect public education, public education agencies, and institutions through legislative mandates, it is important that policy effects be carefully scrutinized. A policy model that helps to generate questions about the allocative, regulative, structural, and redistributive outcomes of policy seem to serve a very useful purpose.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Easton, David. A Systems Analysis of Political Life. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Jones, Charles O. An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Press, 1970.

Schneier, Edward V. (ed.). Policy Making in American Government. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Wirt, F. M., Krist, M. W. Schools in Conflict. Berkeley, California: McCutchen Pub. Corp. 1982.

Public Documents

1983 Cumulaative Supplement to the School Laws of South Carolina 1976. Lawyers Co-Operative Publishing Co., Rochester, N.Y.

Education Improvement Act of 1984 - Implementation Status Report State Department of Education: December 31, 1984

The New Approach to Educational and Economic Excellence in South Carolina Richard W. Riley, Governor, 1984

School Laws of South Carolina 1976 Reprint from The Code of Laws South Carolina 1976 Lawyers Co-Operative Publishing Co., Rochester, N.Y. Issed by the State Department of Education

South Carolina Education Improvement Act of 1984

Periodicals

South Carolina Schools. Volume 36 Number 1. January, 1985, South Carolina Department of Education.